

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS

On September 16, 2003, Applicant submitted an Information Disclosure Statement for this case. The Examiner did not return an initialed copy of that Statement with the Office Action mailed on January 26, 2007. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the referenced cited therein and return an initialed copy of the Statement with the next communication.

In addition, Applicant has submitted herewith another Information Disclosure Statement. Since these references are being brought to the Examiner's attention after the mailing of the First Office Action, Applicant is submitting the fee of \$180 as required by 37 C.F.R. 1.97(c) and 37 C.F.R. 1.17(p).

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed January 26, 2007 the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-17 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,973,669 to Daniels and rejected 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Daniels in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,675,757 to Block.

In response, Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 7-12, 14 and 15 and cancelled claims 5, 13, 16 and 17. No new matter has been added.

Independent claims 1 and 8 recite the ability to control live-pause reproduction of said selected program among first and second reproduction devices. Daniels does not teach or suggest this limitation.

More specifically, Daniels shows only one playback means 18 in Figs. 3-5. Thus, even if Daniels playback means 18 were equivalent to Applicant's claimed "first reproduction device," Daniels would not anticipate independent claims 1 and 8 because Daniels fails to show a "second reproduction device."

In addition, Daniels does not teach or suggest a live-pause operation. The Examiner asserts that Daniels does teach this feature in column 6, lines 28+. This is incorrect. While Daniels does describe time shifting content in this passage, it is incorrect that time shifting involves live-pause commands. Live-pause is a feature that allows a user to invoke recording of streaming or broadcast content and freeze one image on the screen. Thus, the viewer's perception is the content has paused in reproduction while in the background the remaining portion of the content is being recorded. When the viewer resumes reproduction (i.e., undoes the live-pause function), the viewer views

content output from the storage medium and NOT content that is presently being broadcasted or streamed. The presently broadcasted or streamed content is instead written into the memory. The presently streamed or broadcasted content will be reproduced at a later time. Thus, while live-pause reproduction does invoke an element of time shifting, time shifting is not synonymous with live-pause reproduction.

With respect to claims 3, 4, 11 and 12, the Examiner asserts that Daniels teaches a hierarchy or ranking among a plurality of reproduction devices in column 5, lines 28+. Applicant disagrees. As stated previously, Daniels does not teach or suggest a plurality of reproduction devices. Therefore, Daniels cannot teach a hierarchy or ranking either.

With respect to claims 2, 6, 7, 10, 14 and 15, these claims recite functionality between two reproduction devices. As stated previously, Daniels does not teach or suggest two reproduction devices. Therefore, Daniels cannot teach functionality between two reproduction devices.

Claims not specifically mentioned above are allowable due to their dependence on an allowable base claim.

CONCLUSION

No fees beyond those for the Information Disclosure Statement are due for this Amendment. However, the Office is authorized to charge any additional fees or underpayments of fees (including fees for petitions for extensions of time) under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 and 1.17 to account number 502117. Any overpayments should be credited to the same account.

Applicant requests entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the pending claims and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, he is invited to contact Applicant's representative below.

Respectfully submitted,

Alexander Vasilevsky et al.

_____/Benjamin D. Driscoll/
Benjamin D. Driscoll
Reg. No. 41,571
Motorola, Inc.
101 Tournament Drive
Horsham, PA 19044
P (215) 323-1840
F (215) 323-1300

____April 26, 2007____
Date